

### DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the Applicant's communication filed on 04/20/2006 and preliminary amendment concurrently filed therewith. In virtue of this amendment,

- Claims 1-13 were originally filed;
- Claims 12-13 are newly added; and thus,
- Claims 1-13 are currently presented in the instant application.

#### *Quayle Action*

1. This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:

#### *Claim Objections*

- ☐ Claims 1-7 and 9-13 are objected to because of the following informalities <sup>See NOTE</sup>:

Claim 1, line 4, "respective" should be changed to --at least two-- (for terminology consistency);

Claim 1, line 5, delete "the EL lamp" and insert --one of the at least two EL lamps, as a first EL lamp,-- therefor;

Claim 1, line 7, delete "an EL lamp or";

Claim 1, line 8, delete "the EL lamps" and insert --other EL lamp of the at least two EL lamps-- therefor;

Claim 1, line 9, delete "this EL lamp or these EL lamps" and insert --said other EL lamp of the at least two EL lamps-- therefor;

Claim 2, line 3, insert --at least two-- between "the" (second occurrence) and "EL";

Claim 3, line 3, delete "a first one of the EL lamps" and insert --the first EL lamp-- therefor;

Claim 3, line 4, “a second EL lamp” should be changed to --said other EL lamp of the at least two EL lamps-- therefor;

Claim 4, line 2, insert --at least two-- between “the” (second occurrence) and “EL”;

Claim 4, line 6, insert --at least two-- between “the” and “EL”;

Claim 5, line 4, insert --the-- between “for” and “at”;

Claim 5, line 6, insert --EL-- between “two” and “lamps”;

Claim 5, line 8, insert --at least two-- between “the” (first occurrence) and “EL”;

Claim 6, line 2, delete “controller” and insert --plurality of controllers, each controller is configured-- therefor;

Claim 6, line 8, delete “EL lamp or lamps” and insert --the other EL lamp of the at least two lamps-- therefor;

Claim 7, line 3, insert --at least two-- between “the” and “EL”;

Claim 9, line 6, insert --at least two-- between “the” and “EL”;

Claim 10, line 4, insert --at least two-- between “the” and “EL”; and delete “lamp or”;

Claim 11, line 3, delete “charging device” and insert --at least one charging means-- therefor;

Claim 12, line 2, delete “a first” and insert --the first EL lamp-- therefor;

Claim 12, line 3, insert --at least two-- between “the” (first occurrence) and “EL”;

Claim 12, line 4, delete “a second EL lamp” and insert --the other EL lamp of the at least two EL lamps-- therefor;

Claim 13, line 2, replace “one” with --EL lamp--; and insert --at least two-- between “the” (second occurrence) and “EL”; and

Art Unit: 2821

Claim 13, line 5, replace "one" with --EL lamp--; and insert --at least two-- between "the" (second occurrence) and "EL".

Appropriate correction is required.

NOTE: The above correction suggestion is made in light of the submitted disclosure and serving as a hint to Applicant. The claims can be corrected in any other appropriate way to improve antecedent basis and terminology consistency and thus 112-issues would be avoided.

### *Specification Objections*

□ The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it appears to be insufficiently descriptive. It should briefly include at least two EL lamps, device for receiving set-point values, charging device, and controlling device(s) with respect to its setting luminescent brightness of the at least two EL lamps. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

□ For clarity of continuing data with regard to the filing of the national stage application under 35 U.S.C. 371 and the foreign priority claiming benefit, a specific reference to such information should be included in the first sentence(s) of the specification following the title or in an application data sheet.

***Drawings Objections***

□ The drawings are objected to because of (i) lack of textual characters in boxes (such as boxes [10, 12, 40] in Fig. 1; [10, 12, 71, 72] in Fig. 2, and (ii) missing waveforms [128, 138] in Fig. 2.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213, (Comm’r Pat. 1935).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

***Priority***

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 04/20/2006 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 1-13 would be allowed if corrected to overcome the objections set forth above in this Office Action.

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Prior art fails to disclose or fairly suggest an electroluminescent lamp driver for controlling luminescent brightness of at least two EL lamps comprising at least one charging means, and control means for setting the luminescent brightness of one of the at least two EL lamps, as a first EL lamps, with a highest luminescent brightness setpoint by controlling an output parameter of the charging means and for setting the luminescent brightness of other EL lamps of the at least two EL lamps with a lower luminescent brightness setpoint by controlling a time interval during which the other EL lamp of the at least two EL lamps is charged in parallel to the first EL lamp, in combination with the remaining claimed limitations as called for (after correction as suggested) in independent claim 1 (claims 2-13 would be allowed if corrected to overcome the objections set forth above as being dependent upon claim 1).

***Citation of relevant prior art***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Prior art Newton (U.S. Patent No. 7,049,762 B2) discloses a portable fluorescent lamp;

Prior art Koskowich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,861,719) discloses regulated power supplies for electroluminescent lamps;

Prior art Sanderson (U.S. Patent No. 5,686,797) discloses an inverter circuit for electroluminescent lamps;

Prior art Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,300) discloses a controller for operating and controlling a plurality of lamps;

Prior art Sanderson (U.S. Patent No. 5,463,283) discloses a driving circuit for electroluminescent lamps;

Prior art Kamens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,434) discloses a voltage boosting circuit for electroluminescent lamps; and

Prior art Alessio (U.S. Patent No. 5,066,895) discloses a driving circuit for electroluminescent lamps.

### ***Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-1828. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM -4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Owens W. Douglas can be reached on (571) 272-1662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thuy Vinh Tran/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2821  
04/12/2008